

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
NASHVILLE DIVISION

SAMUEL JEFFERSON,)	
)	
Plaintiff)	Case No. 3:12-0988
)	Judge Sharp/Bryant
v.)	Jury Demand
)	
CORIZON HEALTHCARE PROVIDERS,)	
<i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
Defendants)	

O R D E R

Plaintiff has filed his "Request for Corizon Inc. To State the Issues in Dispute Concerning Request for Production & Plaintiff's Interrogatories, and for the Court to Intervene" (Docket Entry No. 80). The undersigned Magistrate Judge liberally construes this request to be a motion to compel discovery pursuant to Rule 37 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

In response, Defendant Corizon states that it has served timely responses to Plaintiff's interrogatories and requests for production, and that these responses were mailed to Plaintiff on February 27, 2013, and received by him on March 2, 2013 (Docket Entry No. 81).

Local Rule 37.01(b)(2) provides that any motion to compel discovery shall quote verbatim each interrogatory or request for production of documents at issue, and shall include the response or grounds for objection asserted by the responding party. Plaintiff Jefferson's motion to compel fails to comply with this requirement, because he has failed to include with his motion Corizon's responses or objections to the written discovery at issue.

For the foregoing reason, Plaintiff's motion to compel discovery (Docket Entry No. 80) is DENIED.

It is so **ORDERED**.

/s/ John S. Bryant
JOHN S. BRYANT
United States Magistrate Judge